



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M No.54247 of 2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 11.03.2025

Akashdeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present:- Ms. Gauri C. Kaushal, Advocate for the applicant/petitioner.

Ms. Manjot Kaur, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

CRM-8143-2025

Application for placing on record the copies of statement/supplementary statement made by Mandeep Kaur w/o Gurdit Singh dated 26.02.2024 & 14.03.2024 as Annexures P-4 & P-5, respectively, with further prayer seeking exemption from filing certified copies thereof.

Notice of the application to the non-applicant/respondent.

Ms. Manjot Kaur, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the non-applicant/respondent and raises no objection to the present application.



In view of the above and for the reasons mentioned in the application, same is allowed subject to all just exceptions. Annexures P-4 & P-5 are taken on record. Registry will tag the same at appropriate place.

MAIN CASE

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No.15 dated 26.02.2024 (P-1), under Sections 450, 364, 380, 302, 182, 148 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (*for short 'IPC'*); Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Bhikhiwind, District Tarn Taran.

(2) Above FIR was registered by *de facto* complainant-Mandeep Kaur with the allegations that petitioner, along with other accused, armed with Pistol, Iron *Rod* and *Datar(s)*, trespassed into their house; assaulted her brother-Satnam Singh (since deceased) and committed murder.

(3) Contends that petitioner was not named in the FIR; rather subsequently nominated on the basis of supplementary statement, made by *de facto* complainant after a period of more than one month; thus, he has been falsely implicated. Further contends that petitioner is ready to join the investigation; therefore, his custodial interrogation would not serve any purpose.

(4) *Per contra*, learned State Counsel, on instructions from quarter concerned, opposed the prayer while submitting that petitioner was specifically named in the supplementary statement and the injuries inflicted



on the head of deceased with *Datar* have been attributed to the petitioner as well as co-accused and the same are corresponding with the Post Mortem Report (*PMR*). Learned State Counsel has produced the disclosure of co-accused Ajay & Sarabjeet Singh, which are taken on record as Mark 'X' & Mark 'Y', respectively.

(5) Heard learned Counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

(6) During the course of investigation, it transpired that main accused Sarabjeet Singh developed illicit relations with co-accused Manjeet Kaur [sister-in-law/*Bhabhi* of Satnam Singh (since deceased)]. The petitioner, along with above co-accused, in furtherance of their common intention, committed murder of Satnam Singh due to the reason that he was objecting illicit relations of accused Sarabjeet Singh and Manjeet Kaur. Further transpires that there is sufficient material available with the police, including disclosure of co-accused Ajay and Sarabjeet Singh (Mark 'X' & 'Y' respectively), which clearly indicate about the role played by petitioner and moreover, the injuries attributed to him also correspond to the *PMR*.

(6.1) Also discernible that one of the weapons of offence i.e. *Datar*, used by co-accused to commit the murder, has also been recovered. After completion of investigation, Final Report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented on 25.05.2024 before the Court of competent jurisdiction against co-accused Manjeet Kaur, Rohit Singh @ Jassa, Ajay & Sarabjeet Singh. Further discernible that there are total 09 accused in the present case and out



of which, 08 have already been arrested, but petitioner is evading the process of law.

(6.2) It is also worthwhile to mention that despite repeated raids made by the police, petitioner is still at large.

(6.3) Thus, *prima facie*, complicity of petitioner is apparent; but he is intentionally not coming forward and the weapon of offence, allegedly used by him in commission of offence, is yet to be recovered.

(6.4) Therefore, this Court is of the opinion, that custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be very much necessary to unearth the truth.

(7) In view of the above, there is no option except to dismiss the petition.

(8) Ordered accordingly.

(9) The above observations be not construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

11th March, 2025

Gagan

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>